



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/076,956	05/13/1998	LUDMILLA BARANOVA	GEN-T104D1	5479

23557 7590 05/15/2002

SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK  
A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION  
2421 N.W. 41ST STREET  
SUITE A-1  
GAINESVILLE, FL 326066669

EXAMINER
----------

CRANE, LAWRENCE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1623

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2002

39

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

All communications respecting this application should give the serial number, date of filing and name of the applicant.



**U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Application Number	Filing Date	First Named Applicant	Attorney Docket Number
09/076,956	05/13/98	Baranova	GEN-T104D1

Examiner
L. E. Crane

Art Unit	Paper No.
1623	38

DATE MAILED: n/a

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel)

(1) Mr. Frank C. Eisenschenk

(3) Examiner Johann R. Richter SPE

(2) Examiner L. E. Crane

(4) Mr. John Lucas

Date of Interview: 04/09/02.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy given to) ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: See attachment.

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some of all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached

Claim(s) discussed: See page 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: See page 2.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment: See p. 2.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would be allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 713.04) If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, the completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.  
PTOL-413 (amended 03/13/01)

09/076,956 - P. N. 38

COPY FOR ☒ File ☐ Applicant

Continued on next page(s) ->>

Art Unit 1623

INTERVIEW SUMMARY(cont.)

Claims discussed: All remaining of record, claim 104 in particular.

Identification of prior art discussed: NONE.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment: Applicant indicated a desire to conclude prosecution without further resort to after final practice. Applicant indicated that the response of November 5, 2001 pointed to the specific parts of the disclosure which supported the structure of claim 104. Examiner Crane respectfully disagreed, noting that attachment of a carbon chain, with or without an additional intervening phosphate or phosphonate linkage to a carbon of the ribose ring, was a structure not properly supported by any of the instant disclosed embodiments. Examiner Crane also suggested that any proposed structure which included a second oxygen bound to the C-3 of the ribose moiety in claim 104 would render the proposed product chemically unstable; e.g. it would be a hemiketal. Applicant suggested that structure "IV" found at page 11 of the disclosure was the intended goal. Applicant also made reference to the French PCT priority document, particularly claim 14 therein. Examiner did not have access to a copy of this document and could not comment. Examiner Richter suggested FAXing a proposal to assist in negotiating allowable subject matter prior to a formal submission and provided his RIGHTFAX telephone number to applicant. Examiner Crane also supplied applicant with the telephone number for the FAX on the 8th floor of CM-1. Examiners reserved judgement concerning the outstanding issues until afforded an opportunity to review applicant's new proposal.